Double parton effects for jets with large rapidity separation

Antoni Szczurek,[1,2,*] Anna Cisek,[3] and Rafal Maciuła[4]

[1] *Institute of Nuclear Physics PAN, PL-31-342 Cracow, Poland*
[2] *University of Rzeszów, PL-35-959 Rzeszów, Poland*
[3] *University of Rzeszów, Poland*
[4] *Institute of Nuclear Physics PAN, Kraków, Poland*

arXiv:1411.4515v1 [hep-ph] 17 Nov 2014

Abstract

We discuss production of four jets $pp \to jjjjX$ with at least two jets with large rapidity separation in proton-proton collisions at the LHC through the mechanism of double-parton scattering (DPS). The cross section is calculated in a factorizaed approximation. Each hard subprocess is calculated in LO collinear approximation. The LO pQCD calculations are shown to give a reasonably good descritption of CMS and ATLAS data on inclusive jet production. It is shown that relative contribution of DPS is growing with increasing rapidity distance between the most remote jets, center-of-mass energy and with decreasing (mini)jet transverse momenta. We show also result for angular azimuthal dijet correlations calculated in the framework of k_t-factorization approaximation.

PACS numbers: 13.87.Ce, 14.65.Dw

*Electronic address: Antoni.Szczurek@ifj.edu.pl

I. INTRODUCTION

Almost 25 years ago Mueller and Navelet predicted strong decorrelation in relative azimuthal angle [1] of jets widely separated in rapidity due to exchange of the BFKL ladder between quarks. The underlying mechanism is shown in the left panel of Fig.1. The leading-logarithm approximation was studied in several papers [1–6]. Recent higher-order BFKL calculation slightly modified this simple picture [7–16]. The involved calculations give similar result as the standard next-to-leading order perturbative calculations in QCD.

On the other hand recent studies of multiparton interactions shown that such effects may easily produce two objects (particles) that are emitted far in rapidity. Very good example is production of $c\bar{c}c\bar{c}$ [17–19] or inclusive production of two J/ψ [20, 21]. Recently two of us presented a first estimation of the DPS effects for jets widely separated in rapidity [24]. The underlying mechanism is shown in the right panel of Fig.1.



FIG. 1: The production of jets widely separated in rapidity via Mueller-Navelet mechanism (left) and within double-parton scattering mechanism (right).

Here we report first results for DPS production of jets widely separated in rapidity. In addition we shall show first corresponding results obtained within k_t-factorization approach [25]. An example of corresponding diagram in show in Fig.2. The blob in the figure represents hard off-shell matrix element. As an example we shall discuss azimuthal correlation between jets from the blob. This is very different than in the BFKL Mueller-Navelet approach where correlation between the most remote (mini)jet in the ladder (see left panel) are considered.

In this presentation we shall compare the different results and discuss some possibile future directions.

II. BASICS OF THE FORMALISM

All partonic cross sections are calculated only in leading order. The cross section for dijet production can be then written as:

$$\frac{d\sigma(ij \to kl)}{dy_1 dy_2 d^2p_t} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2 \hat{s}^2} \sum_{i,j} x_1 f_i(x_1, \mu^2)\; x_2 f_j(x_2, \mu^2)\; \overline{|\mathcal{M}_{ij\to kl}|^2}\;. \tag{2.1}$$

In our calculations we include all leading-order $ij \to kl$ partonic subprocesses. The K-factor for dijet production are rather small, of the order of $1.1 - 1.3$ (see e.g. [26, 27], but can be



FIG. 2: A typical diagram with two gluonic ladders relevant for the k_t-factorization approach.

easily incorporated in our calculations. Below we shall show that already the leading-order approach gives results in sufficiently reasonable agreement with recent ATLAS [28] and CMS [31] data.

This simplified leading-order approach can be however used easily in calculating DPS differential cross sections. A multi-dimensional cross section can be written as:

$$\frac{d\sigma^{DPS}(pp \to 4\text{jets } X)}{dy_1 dy_2 d^2p_{1t} dy_3 dy_4 d^2p_{2t}} = \sum_{i_1,j_1,k_1,l_1;i_2,j_2,k_2,l_2} \frac{\mathcal{C}}{\sigma_{eff}} \frac{d\sigma(i_1 j_1 \to k_1 l_1)}{dy_1 dy_2 d^2p_{1t}} \frac{d\sigma(i_2 j_2 \to k_2 l_2)}{dy_3 dy_4 d^2p_{2t}} , \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } i_1 j_1 = i_2 j_2 \wedge k_1 l_1 = k_2 l_2 \\ 1 & \text{if } i_1 j_1 \neq i_2 j_2 \vee k_1 l_1 \neq k_2 l_2 \end{array} \right\}$ and partons $j, k, l, m = g, u, d, s, \bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s}$. The combinatorial factors include identity of the two subprocesses. Each step of DPS is calculated in the leading-order approach (see Eq.(2.1)).

Experimental data from Tevatron [32] and LHC [33] provide an estimate of σ_{eff} in the denominator of formula (2.2). In the calculations, result of which are presented here, we have taken $\sigma_{eff} = 15$ mb.

In this presentation we shall also show some correlations between jets obtained in the k_t-factorization approach. In the k_t-factorization approach the cross section differential in each jet rapidity and transverse momentum can be written as:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dy_1 dy_2 d^2p_{1,t} d^2p_{2,t}} = \sum_{i,j,k,l} \int \frac{d^2\kappa_{1,t}}{\pi} \frac{d^2\kappa_{2,t}}{\pi} \frac{1}{16\pi^2 (x_1 x_2 s)^2} \overline{|\mathcal{M}_{ij\to kl}|^2}$$
$$\times \quad \delta^2 \left(\vec{\kappa}_{1,t} + \vec{\kappa}_{2,t} - \vec{p}_{1,t} - \vec{p}_{2,t} \right) \mathcal{F}_i(x_1, \kappa_{1,t}^2, \mu_f^2) \, \mathcal{F}_j(x_2, \kappa_{2,t}^2, \mu_f^2) \quad (2.3)$$

Above $\mathcal{F}$'s denote unintegrated gluon (parton) distribution (UGDF). The indecies i, j mean reggeized partons, gluons, quarks and antiquarks. In this presentation we shall use Kimber-Martin-Ryskin unintegrated parton distributions [29]. The formulae for off-shell matrix elements were obtained e.g. in [30] and corresponding formulae can be used in our calculations.

III. SELECTED RESULTS

Before we shall show our results for rapidity-distant-jet correlations we wish to show the quality of the description of some observables for inclusive jet production. In Fig. 3 we show as an example distributions in jet transverse momentum for different intervals of jet (pseudo)rapidity. In these calculations we have used MSTW08 PDFs [34]. The agreement with recent ATLAS data [28] is fairly reasonable which allows to use the same distributions for the evalution of the DPS effects for large rapidity distances between jets. In Ref.[24] we have shown also some results relevant for the CMS collaboration measurements.



FIG. 3: Transverse momentum distribution of jets for different regions of the jet rapidity (left panel) and corresponding rapidity distribution of jets with different cuts in p_t as specified in the figure caption. The theoretical calculations were performed with the MSTW08 parton distributions [34]. The data points were obtained by the ATLAS collaboration [28].

Now we shall proceed to the jets with large rapidity separation. In Fig. 4 we show distribution in the rapidity distance between two jets in leading-order collinear calculation and between the most distant jets in rapidity in the case of four DPS jets. In this calculation we have included cuts characteristic for the CMS expriments [23]. For comparison we show also results for BFKL calculation from Ref. [14]. For this kinematics the DPS jets give sizeable contribution only at large rapidity distance. However, the four-jet (DPS) and dijet (LO SPS) final state can be easily distinguished and in principle one can concentrate on the DPS contribution which is interesting by itself. The NLL BFKL cross section (long-dashed line) is sizeably lower than that for the LO collinear approach (short-dashed line). This causes that the general situation is not clear.

Let us now show results for even smaller transverse momenta (see Fig. 5). A measurement of such minijets may be, however, difficult. Now the DPS contribution may even exceed the standard SPS dijet contribution. How to measure such minijets is an open issue. In principle one could measure for instance correlations of semihard ($p_t \sim 10$ GeV) neutral pions with the help of so-called zero-degree calorimeters (ZDC). This will be discussed elsewhere.

Finally let us discuss azimuthal correlations between jets widely separated in rapidity. In Fig.6 we show results obtained in the k_t-factorization approach with the Kimber-Martin-Ryskin UGDF [29] for different factorization scales described in the figure. The distributions are normalized to the integrated cross section for the corresponding experimental acceptance range. In fact the cross section obtained with $\mu_f^2 = M_{jj}^2$ is much smaller than that obtained with $\mu_f^2 = m_t^2$ (m_t is jet transverse mass) [25]. The distribution corresponding to DPS is a straight line (the two different hard processes are not correlated) and considerably modify the distribution for $\mu_f^2 = M_{jj}^2$ and only slightly modify the distribution corresponding to



FIG. 4: Distribution in rapidity distance between the jet (35 GeV $< p_t <$ 60 GeV) with maximal (the most positive) and minimal (the most negative) rapidities. The collinear pQCD result is shown by the short-dashed line and the DPS result by the solid line for $\sqrt{s}$ = 7 TeV (left panel) and $\sqrt{s}$ = 14 TeV (right panel). For comparison we also show results for the BFKL Mueller-Navelet jets in leading-logarithm and next-to-leading-order logarithm approaches from Ref. [14].



FIG. 5: The same as in the previous figure but now for somewhat smaller lower cut on minijet transverse momentum.

$\mu_f^2 = m_t^2$. All the details of the calculations will be presented in our future paper [25].

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

In this presentation we have discussed how the double-parton scattering effects may contribute to large-rapidity-distance dijet correlations. The calculation was performed in leading-order to understand and explore the general situation. This means that each step of DPS was calculated in pQCD leading order. We have shown that already leading-order calculation provides quite adequate description of inclusive jet production when confronted with the results obtained by the ATLAS collaboration.

We have concentrated on distributions in rapidity distance between the most-distant jets in rapidity. The results of the dijet SPS mechanism have been compared to those for the DPS mechanism. We have performed calculations relevant for a planned CMS analysis. The contribution of the DPS mechanism increases with increasing distance in rapidity between jets.



FIG. 6: Dijet azimuthal angle distribution for large rapidity separation. We show result of k_t-factorization approach [25] with Kimber-Martin-Ryskin unintegrated distributions for different factorization scales as well as preliminary experimental data of the CMS collaboration [22].

We have also shown some recent predictions of the Mueller-Navelet jets in the LL and NLL BFKL framework. For the CMS configuration the DPS contribution is smaller than the dijet collinear SPS contribution even at the high rapidity distances and only slightly smaller than that for the NLL BFKL calculation. The DPS final state topology is clearly different than that for the collinear dijet SPS which may help to disentangle the two mechanisms. More refined analysis should take into account two- three- and four-jet final states.

We have shown that the relative effect of DPS could be increased by lowering the transverse momenta of jets but such measurements can be difficult if not impossible (in addition there is a similar tendency in the BFKL approach). Alternatively one could study correlations of semihard neutral pions widely separated in rapidity. LHCf collaboration at ATLAS could consider such measurements.

The DPS effects are interesting not only in the context how they contribute to distribution in rapidity distance between jets but also per se. One could make use of correlations in jet transverse momenta, jet transverse-momentum imbalance (see [24]) and azimuthal correlations to enhance the contribution of DPS.

[1] A. H. Mueller, and H. Navelet, Nucl. Phys. **B282**, 727 (1987).
[2] V. Del Duca and C. R. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 4510 (1994); arXiv:9311290 [hep-ph].
[3] W. J. Stirling, Nucl. Phys. **B423**, 56 (1994); arXiv:9401266 [hep-ph].
[4] V. Del Duca and C. R. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 2150 (1995); arXiv:9407359 [hep-ph].
[5] V. T. Kim and G. B. Pivovarov, Phys. Rev. **D 53**, 6 (1996); arXiv:9506381 [hep-ph].
[6] J. Andersen, V. Del Duca, S. Frixione, C. Schmidt and W. J Stirling, J. High Energy Phys. **02**, 007 (2001); arXiv:0101180 [hep-ph].
[7] J. Bartels, D. Colferai and G. Vacca, Eur. Phys. J. **C24**, 83 (2002); Eur. Phys. J. **C 29**, 235 (2003).
[8] A. Sabio Vera and F. Schwennsen, Nucl. Phys. **B776**, 170 (2007); arXiv:0702158 [hep-ph].
[9] C. Marquet and C. Royon, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 034028 (2009); arXiv:0704.3409 [hep-ph].
[10] D. Colferai, F. Schwennsen, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, J. High Energy Phys. **12**, 026

(2010); arXiv:1002.1365 [hep-ph].
[11] F. Caporale, D. Y. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa and A. Perri, J. High Energy Phys. **02**, 101 (2012); arXiv:1112.3752 [hep-ph].
[12] D. Y. Ivanov and A. Papa, J. High Energy Phys. **05**, 086 (2012); arXiv:1202.1082 [hep-ph].
[13] F. Caporale, D. Y. Ivanov, B. Murdaca and A. Papa, Nucl. Phys. **B877**, 73 (2013); arXiv:1211.7225 [hep-ph].
[14] B. Ducloue, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, J. High Energy Phys. **05**, 096 (2013); arXiv:1302.7012 [hep-ph].
[15] B. Ducloue, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, arXiv:1309.3229 [hep-ph].
[16] V. Del Duca, L. J. Dixon, C. Duhr, J. Pennington, J. High Energy Phys. **02**, 086 (2014): arXiv:1309.6647.
[17] M. Łuszczak, R. Maciuła, and A. Szczurek, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 094034 (2012); arXiv:1111.3255 [hep-ph].
[18] R. Maciuła, and A. Szczurek, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 074039 (2013); arXiv:1301.4469 [hep-ph].
[19] A. van Hameren, R. Maciuła and A. Szczurek, arXiv:1402.6972 [hep-ph].
[20] C. H. Kom, A. Kulesza and W. J. Stirling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 082002 (2011), arXiv:1105.4186 [hep-ph].
[21] S. P. Baranov, A. M. Snigirev, N. P. Zotov, A. Szczurek, and W. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 034035 (2013); arXiv:1210.1806 [hep-ph].
[22] S. Chatrchyan et al. (the CMS Collaboration), CMS-PAS-FSQ-12-002 (2013).
[23] I. Pozdnyakov, private communication
[24] R. Maciula and A. Szczurek, Phys. Rev. **D90** (2014) 014022.
[25] A. Cisek, R. Maciula and A. Szczurek, a paper in preparation.
[26] J. M. Campbell, J. W. Huston and W. J. Stirling, Rept. Prog. Phys. **70**, 89 (2007); arXiv:0611148 [hep-ph].
[27] A. Gehrmann-De Ridder, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover and J. Pires, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 162003 (2013); arXiv:1301.7310 [hep-ph].
[28] G. Aad et al. (the ATLAS collaboration), Eur. Phys. J. **C 71**, 1512 (2011).; arXiv:1009.5908 [hep-ex]
[29] M. Kimber, A.D. Martin and M. Ryskin, Eur. Phys. J. **C12** 655 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9911379; M. Kimber, A.D. Martin and M. Ryskin, Phys. rev. **D63** 114027 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0101348.
[30] M. Nefedov, V. Saleev and A.V. Shipilova, Phys. Rev. **D87** 094030 (2013); arXiv:1304.3549 [hep-ph].
[31] S. Chatrchyan et al. (the CMS collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 132001 (2011); arXiv:1106.0208 [hep-ex].
[32] F. Abe et al. (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. **D56**, 3811 (1997);
Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 584 (1997);
V. M. Abazov, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 052012 (2010).
[33] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), J. High Energy Phys. **06**, 141 (2012).
[34] A.D. Martin, W.J. Stirling, R.S. Thorne and G. Watt, Eur. Phys. J. **C63** (2009) 189;
Eur. Phys. J. **C64** (2009) 653.